#### **Evaluation**

1. If the MDRDP tool is used as data source to measure kindergarten transition activities, does it have to be used every year or can it be used every other year, as has currently been the practice? Also, should the MDRDP tool be used to measure bridge program participants as a separate group and provided to the State separately?

Answer: Neither of these situations appears to be an appropriate use of the MDRDP. The MDRDP is not intended to be used for measuring individual children's progress. In accordance with First 5's agreement with the California Department of Education, the MDRDP should only be used by entities that have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the State Commission, which outlines appropriate uses of the tool. Please contact the First 5 California Research and Evaluation staff for a copy of the MOU. Also, consider using the full DRDP tool or another evidence-based child assessment.

**2. Attachment 7** What is the outcome associated with the Service Area "Community Strengthening Efforts"? Currently there is no outcome associated with the Service Area in the Preliminary SR Menu of Outcomes and Indicators.

Answer: As part of our effort to simplify fiscal and accountability reporting to the State, the list of service areas will be the same for all First 5 programs. However, not all of the listed service areas have outcomes associated with them for School Readiness reporting. To fulfill the School Readiness minimum reporting requirement, it will be necessary to select a service area that corresponds to an outcome/indicator combination from the menu. Once the minimum reporting requirement is met, tracking and reporting additional indicators is encouraged and welcome.

**3. Form 7,** On the 2/23/06 conference call it was mentioned that additional columns need to be added to make this form accurate. Specifically to add other family members to the Populations Served section. When will the corrected form be available?

Answer: Please see the attached revised Form 7. Note that when/if the Evaluation Workgroup makes changes to Annual Report forms and instructions, this form will change as well for consistency.

**4. Form 7**, please describe how to include unduplicated counts for application and reporting purposes.

Answer: Service providers will report unduplicated counts to the funded SR Program (at the application level), who will report aggregated data to the State. Additional instructions regarding reporting of unduplicated data are currently under development by the Evaluation Workgroup.

#### **Fiscal**

**1. Form 5-**What types of expenses may be included in the SR Program budget(s)?

Answer: Only expenses directly attributable to the SR Program (with accounting documentation to that effect on file) may be included in the budget. If the expense is not directly attributable to the SR Program (e.g., general indirect costs, etc.) it should not be included on Form 5.

If the SR Program budget will be charged for a percentage of overall agency costs, such as rent, the methodology for assigning the percentage to be charged should be fully described in the budget narrative and the exact amount should be included in the budget as a distinct line item called "Rent," under the Materials and Supplies category. Please use the version of Form 5 included in the RFF, released February 1, 2006.

**2. Form 5-**There is not a budget category for such costs as training, travel, etc. (non contract). Where should we list these items?

Answer: Costs such as training and travel are operating expenses and should be listed as line items under Material and Supplies. Additional examples of operating expenses include printing, communication, postage, insurance, facilities operation (rent, maintenance, etc.), and office equipment. Any such costs may be included in the budget if they are directly attributable to the SR Program. See also Fiscal Question #1 above. Please use the version of Form 5 included in the RFF, released February 1, 2006.

#### **Program**

1. We currently fund programs in several SR school communities/neighborhoods through our SR funds. We plan to redesign the program this year and will be proposing a program modification when we submit our reapplication(s) in 2007. We plan to continue our work with the same communities but would like to consider adding 1 or 2 more. We know that we must adhere to the SR Program maintenance of effort policy and are therefore expected to continue our commitment to existing SR school communities in the amount and spectrum of services. We currently fund one of our programs with twice as much SR funding as the others because this program serves two schools. With school closures and mergers anticipated in our county we might not have the same schools in the future. Is it okay to use half of the money from that community to help fund SR activities in new communities?

Answer: Yes, some of the funds previously used to serve a community that will undergo school closures/reductions may be used to fund SR activities in new communities. However, the maintenance of effort requirements for existing SR communities and program expansion guidelines described on RFF Pgs 11-12 must be adhered to. Additionally, as described on RFF Pg 26, any application(s) that include expanded or new programs must include recently completed needs assessment data (completed within 6 months of the application submission date). Also refer to Program Section #9 of the first set of RFF FAQ's, available on our website at <a href="https://www.ccfc.ca.gov/schoolready1.htm">www.ccfc.ca.gov/schoolready1.htm</a>.

**2. Attachment 6-**Do we have to substantiate and explain the use of the Ages and Stages Questionnaire or Raising a Reader as evidence-based practices because they are not listed in RFF Attachment 6?

Answer: No, both the Ages and Stages Questionnaire and Raising a Reader are evidence-based practices and, by this reference, may be considered as incorporated in RFF Attachment 6.

For those SR Programs interested in using Ages and Stages, please visit http://www.brookespublishing.com/store/books/bricker-asg/index.htm.

For those SR Programs interested in using Raising a Reader, please visit <a href="http://www.pcf.org/raising\_reader/research.html">http://www.pcf.org/raising\_reader/research.html</a> for more information.

**3. Attachment 6-** I am trying to coordinate a plan for cross training and curriculum sharing between ECE and primary teachers, but there are no evidence-based practices listed in the Chart (Attachment 6). Do you know of promising practices and where I could access them? Also, please provide examples of evidence-based practices in the area of Improved Systems of Care (e.g., School's Readiness for Children) and where I can access them.

#### **Answer:**

There have been several briefs recommending best practices for both cross training and curriculum sharing. One suggestion in the cross training area is "Enhancing Transition to Kindergarten- Linking Children, Families and Schools" Marcia E. Iraft-Sayre, Robert C Pianta (use this link to access the document <a href="http://discovery.wcgmf.org/resources/sps">http://discovery.wcgmf.org/resources/sps</a> resource 363.pdf). The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), and National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) may also provide useful information.

Additionally, please also access the First 5 California Toolkits (i.e., Collaboration, Ready Schools, Systems Change, Transition to Kindergarten, etc.) on the internet at <a href="http://www.healthychild.ucla.edu/First5CAReadiness/Default.asp">http://www.healthychild.ucla.edu/First5CAReadiness/Default.asp</a>.

A resource for potential evidence-based practices in the area of Improved Systems of Care (e.g., School's Readiness for Children) is the California Department of Education's 2006 Educational Resource Catalog. The catalog is available on the internet (<a href="http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/pn/rc/documents/catalog2006.pdf">http://www.cde.ca.gov/re/pn/rc/documents/catalog2006.pdf</a>) and includes a variety of useful publications such as the Pre-Kindergarten Learning and Development Guidelines and Administration of Early Childhood Special Education Programs.

**4. Form 3-**Applying programs are instructed to "list all outcomes that you will track locally that represent your complete SR Program; and identify those that you will report to the State." Are programs expected to submit logic models for all outcomes/indicators or only those being reported to the State as part of the statewide evaluation?

Answer: Yes, applying programs will submit logic models for all outcomes/indicators they will be tracking, whether for State reporting or local purposes.

**5. Form 8-**The RFF requests an MOU/collaborative agreement for each partner listed. Will a detailed description of partner roles and responsibilities on partner agency letterhead meet this requirement?

Answer: Yes, a detailed description of partner roles and responsibilities on partner agency letterhead will meet this requirement. Additionally, the agreement should include the signature of the partner agency's executive director/president/chair or his/her designee and should specify the amount of local cash match being provided (if applicable).

**6.** Do Forms 2 and 3 need to match-up/list the same practices or can Form 2 be a little more detailed in listing out "practices"?

Answer: The Cycle 2 practices included on Form 2 should match those included on Form 3.

**7. Form 2 and RFF Pg 27** (Narrative, Explanation of Changes and Rationale), what is considered "new services"? Using last year's 04-05 program designs and listing changes that will be made going into Cycle 2 or looking at changes made to programs since original applications were submitted? Our programs are now very different from what was submitted in the original applications. Many changes were made during the start-up/development phase.

Answer: When completing Form 2 please list <u>all</u> practices employed since the inception of the program, in the column titled "Cycle 1 Practices," note any practices that were discontinued or deleted along the way with an X in the shaded portion of the same column. The narrative portion (Explanation of Changes and Rationale) of the application should provide greater detail to the summary documented on Form 2. The column titled "Cycle 2 Practices" should include all practices to be undertaken in Cycle 2.

**8. Form 3-**Is it okay to <u>not</u> submit an Evidence-Based Practice for parent workshops? We have not been able to find anything for it. This service area will not be for State reporting.

Answer: No, the use of evidence-based practices is a requirement for Cycle 2 funding. However, applying programs may select promising practices for which there is preliminary and/or local data supporting its use or describe how a current evidence-based practice will be modified and used for a specific target population. Also see RFF Pg 13 for a summary of how the "implementation of evidence-based practices" requirement can be met.